

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the *Office Action* dated August 6, 2008. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the Application. Claims 2, 5, 7, 10, 13, 15, 18, 21, and 23 have been amended. Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8-9, 11-12, 14, 16-17, 19-20, 22, and 24-26 have been cancelled. New Claims 27-39 have been added. For at least the reasons discussed below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

**Section 101 Rejection**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-2, 5-7, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. To expedite prosecution, however, Claim 27 has been amended, and new Claims 28-39 have been added. The claims are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101, and thus are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

**Section 112 Rejection**

The Examiner rejects Claims 17, 18, and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. To expedite prosecution, however, new Claims 35-38 have been added, and Claims 18, 21, and 23 have been amended. The claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter the Applicants regard as the invention, and thus are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

**Section 103(a) Rejection**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-10, 12-15, 17-18, 20-23, and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,948,040 to DeLorme et al. ("*DeLorme*") in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0095319 to Swart et al. ("*Swart*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of the cited portions of *DeLorme* and *Swart* proposed by the Examiner fail to disclose, teach, or suggest elements specifically recited in Applicants' claims. For example, the cited portions of the proposed *DeLorme-Swart* combination fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the following recited in amended independent Claim 27:

sending at least one user descriptor of the plurality of user descriptors through an interface of the user agent to an interface of at least one service agent of the plurality of service agents;

receiving at the interface of the user agent from the interface of the at least one service agent at least one service offering generated by comparing the sent at least one user descriptor to at least one knowledge base coupled to the at least one service agent.

According to the *Office Action*, *DeLorme* discloses “using a service agent operating as a service finder.” Page 5. The cited portion of *DeLorme*, however, merely discloses that a TRIPS user can interact with a variety of different services and systems:

The TRIPS user can be provided with communications links for online communication and transfer of reservation data, ticketing data, spatially related data, and software tools for map reading between computers and between users. For example a TRIPS user may communicate with another TRIPS system or user for transfer of user location data and any other spatially related data. In addition to a travel service providing reservation and ticketing data, the TRIPS user can also communicate with external databases, a central communications service bureau, and on-line mapping services for latest information relating to loc/objects, routes, and map modifications, priority messages, etc.

Col. 10, ll. 21-31.

Additionally, the cited portions of *DeLorme* disclose that user preferences may be taken into account by the TRIPS system itself:

After selecting “scuba-diving” related to “coral reefs” in Topics 415, Sara Smith can prompt and preview a display of TRIPS maps of the locations of particular “coral reefs.” The presentation of maps can further include listings and location information about a specific collection of scheduled events related to “scuba diving” [.]

See col. 41, ll. 45-50.

These portions of *DeLorme*, however, do not disclose, teach, or suggest “sending at least one user descriptor ... through an interface of the user agent to an interface of at least one service agent” nor do they disclose “receiving at the interface of the user agent from the interface of the at least one service agent at least one service offering,” much less “at least

one service offering generated by comparing the sent at least one user descriptor to at least one knowledge base coupled to the at least one service agent.”

The cited portions of the proposed *DeLorme-Swart* combination also fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the following recited in amended independent claim 27:

sending a set of user descriptors of the plurality of user descriptors through an interface of the user agent to an interface of at least one advertising agent; and  
receiving at the interface of the user agent from the interface of the at least one advertising agent at least one advertisement generated by comparing the sent set of user descriptors to at least service description stored in a database coupled to the at least one advertising agent.

The cited portions of *DeLorme* merely disclose a list of advertisements on the TRIPS system that may be computer-searched or user-browsed:

The GOODS/SERVICES & PROVIDERS LIST can be computer-searched or user-browsed for one or many of the plurality of participating providers as well as particular or categorical goods/services that are offered, brokered or promoted by special coupon offers on the TRIPS online or Internet site.

Col. 64, ll. 5-10.

The cited portions of *DeLorme*, however, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest “receiving at the interface of the user agent from the interface of the at least one advertising agent at least one advertisement generated by comparing the sent set of user descriptors to at least service description stored in a database coupled to the at least one advertising agent.”

Thus, the proposed *DeLorme-Swart* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the elements of amended Claim 27. For at least these reasons, independent Claim 27 and its dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103. For analogous reasons, independent Claims 31, 35, 39, and their respective dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 2, 5-7, 10, 13, 15, 18, 21, 23, and 27-39.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Keiko Ichiye, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6494.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants



Keiko Ichiye  
Reg. No. 45,460

Date: November 6, 2008

**Correspondence Address:**

**Customer Number: 05073**